

HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
JULY 17, 2008

The Hamilton County Airport Authority met on Thursday, July 17, 2008 in the Commissioners Courtroom in the Hamilton County Government and Judicial Center, One Hamilton County Square, Noblesville, Indiana. President Silvey called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. Roll Call was taken and a quorum declared present of Tom Kapostasy, Ted Moran, Don Silvey and Ted Moran. Allyn Beaver and Scott Alexander were absent.

**Approval of Minutes**

Kapostasy motioned to approve the minutes of June 5, 2008. Moran seconded. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

**Committee Reports**

Community and Public Relations

Warren White, Willow Marketing, distributed the latest version of the Indianapolis Executive Airport (IEA) brochure for the Board's review.

White distributed a copy of the Phase 2 Marketing Research Survey. The plan is to distribute the survey through E-mail and they will finish with a phone survey if they do not receive the number of responses they require.

Rauch stated the second payment of the Destination Hamilton County Grant has been sent but the check was made out to the Indianapolis Executive Airport. The check has been returned to the Hamilton County Convention and Visitors Bureau (HCCVB) requesting a change in the payee to Hamilton County.

**Indianapolis Executive Airport**

Andrea Montgomery reported the fly-in for the Indiana Down's Syndrome Foundation was a great success, they raised \$9,200.

The Public Advisory Committee met at the airport on July 10, 2008. The invoice for the food has been sent to Kim (Rauch) for payment. The Public Hearing will be July 31, 2008 from 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. at the airport.

The Aviation Association of Indiana (AAI) quarterly meeting was held July 17, 2008 at the Dekalb County Airport.

Andrea attended the Indiana Chamber of Commerce meeting. They will start adding the word aviation to all of their documents for legislation that discuss highways, ports, and railroads. They are also supporting the AAI position of dedicated funding for the Indiana Department of Transportation for aviation. The Indiana Chamber of Commerce is interested in drafting legislation that protects the airports and abandoned railways on a state level.

HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
JULY 17, 2008

The AAI Annual Meeting will be held October 14-17, 2008 at Potawatomi Inn in Pokagon State Park. Montgomery asked Chris Snyder if he has scheduled a meeting with the FAA (Federal Aviation Authority)? Snyder stated he has not scheduled a meeting at this time; they usually set the meeting times one month ahead of the meeting. He will keep requesting a meeting.

Andrea reviewed the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter report. Income was forecast at \$38,950 (excluding farm income) and collected income was \$38,413, they are at 89% of the forecasted income for the year.

Fuel Fees were forecasted at \$24,377 and actual collected were \$25,082.

Expenses were forecast at \$32,229 and actual spent was \$22,457. Montgomery paid the county \$10,000 for the second quarter.

The Fuel Report for the period ending June 30, 2008 and the second quarter bank statements were submitted. The flowage fees are off \$0.38 and they will let it ride at this time.

Carl Winkler has prepared the application for AAI Airport of the Year and Don Silvey has signed the application.

Million & Company completed the 2007 Audit of the IEA Checking Account. One exception was found – Montgomery Aviation owes Hamilton County \$392.06 for ramp parking fees. Hamilton County owes Montgomery Aviation \$346.00 (\$80.50 for T-hangar rent and \$265.50 for fuel flowage). Montgomery Aviation owes Hamilton County \$46.06 which will be deposited in the checking account in the third quarter.

Dan Montgomery stated the Board needs to notify the Bailey's regarding the rental of the farm ground. Mike Howard stated Montgomery should notify Bailey that we will be accepting sealed bids at the September 4, 2008 meeting. Howard will prepare the bid documents.

Moran asked Howard about Montgomery's contract, it mentions a list of facilities and that was not included in the contract. Howard stated it will be attached. Moran asked Dan Montgomery if the traffic for the month been primarily jet traffic? Montgomery stated it has been mostly transient jet traffic.

Silvey stated the FAA funding schedule for the runway reconstruction and the 2012 Super Bowl is tight and it will be a challenge to get the airport ready for the Super Bowl. Howard stated that project probably needs to be first on the schedule for FAA funding. Chris Snyder stated the FAA has changed their deadlines; they are trying to release planned discretionary money in June as they did this year. The runway reconstruction is planned for 2011, Snyder stated there will be a contractor on site for a summer construction project in 2011 and if

HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
JULY 17, 2008

we need a ramp before that we might want to factor that into the project. Snyder recommended bidding the project early in 2011 so the bid pricing can be submitted to the FAA and we should be in good shape to receive planned discretionary funding. Snyder stated we might want to make a push for the bidding in late 2010 and construction could start in 2011 and this would make the Board less dependent on 2011 funding. Snyder stated by the time the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) is submitted we will have a good idea of what the transportation bill will look like and that will help us understand where we stand with FAA funding.

Warren White reminded the Board that 2011 is the 100 year anniversary of the Indianapolis Speedway and beginning in 2009 they are planning a three year celebration to culminate in 2011 with many events and activities producing heavier traffic in that time period.

RCO License

Carl Winkler stated they have received their RCO (Remote Communications Outlet) license. Moran asked if this is a dedicated phone line? Winkler stated it is a GSO, the temporary license applied for was a 50 watt transmitter, they would like us to transmit at 2.5 watts. Moran stated the transmissions affected by this decrease in power would be for us? Winkler stated this transmission happens about 1 mile from their building, where the receiver is located.

**Woolpert Engineering Report**

Glideslope

Snyder stated on Tuesday, July 15 the FAA did the flight check of the Glideslope. The Glideslope failed the Flight Check. The FAA did work with the contractor to see why it was failing, they checked the data to make sure the FAA had properly designed the approach, they checked the survey data to insure they had properly incorporated the survey data, and they looked at the fuel conditions to determine if the actual site, grading in front of the Glideslope and objects above ground, were affecting the Glideslope's performance. The contractor sent a report requesting Woolpert look at all three of these items to determine the problem. Snyder went on site and verified the actual locations and information that was submitted to make sure everything was correct. Snyder confirmed that the data was correct and sent the confirmation to the FAA. Snyder stated sometimes the data is inputted wrong, Snyder checked the FAA data and it was inputted correctly. The field site conditions were being problematic with the Glideslope. The contractor did explain why we were having specific problems with the performance of the Glideslope due to the site conditions. We started with a Glideslope system that has a weak performance. On the existing site there is a measurement from the existing equipment on how it is calibrated to determine the site conditions. They are allowed to go less than 30 micro amps to get an acceptable approach procedure, when they are under 30 micro amps the Glideslope path does not shut off at a short distance which means there is a

HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
JULY 17, 2008

problem in front of the Glideslope that is shutting it off. We started with 24 to 26 micro amps. When they put the Glideslope on the new location they were measuring 32 to 34 micro amps so we were a little high. Snyder asked the contractor if the site could be that sensitive to the actual conditions of how the equipment performs. The contractor told him the moisture in the soils can sway it 3 to 5 micro amps and the timing of the day could swing the micro amps. Trying it another time of day is not a good solution. The contractor recommended either replacing the Glideslope equipment, upgrade the Glideslope equipment or change the site conditions. Snyder stated he and the contractor reviewed these three options by looking at costs and the reliability of insuring it gets fixed in the time they have. Snyder stated he is aiming for the highest reliability; they can do site work but it was explained to him that this equipment is so sensitive that we could fix one little thing and it could be ok but we could fix it and then find something else because of the reflectivity of the equipment. There is more risk in fixing the site. To replace the equipment is not an option at this point because it is significant. Some of the land that may need to be cleared or re-graded is off airport property, there is a concern that a fence or some trees would have to be removed. From a timing aspect this is not a acceptable solution.

There are four different types of Glideslopes, there is a Null Reference system, which is what IEA has. This is the most basic system and it is being eliminated due to its age, sensitivity and accuracy. The system can be upgraded by adding an additional antenna on the tower so it becomes a three antenna system. A new piece of equipment will need to be added as an upgrade. That is a Capture Effect Glideslope. This is a good Glideslope, it checks for irregularities and helps bring in an aircraft, especially when the terrain gets rougher. The FAA only orders Capture Effect Glideslopes because they would run into this same situation all of the time. The most realistic option is to upgrade the system and put a capture effect system on the equipment. The complications are the timing, a brand new upgrade will take four months to obtain and we will not make the September publication date, which we don't want to do. The contractor has a system in his shop that is available; the system has to be upgraded slightly. They have to wire it for our system specifically. It is not a brand new system; it is a couple of generations older than a new system. It will work very effectively. Performance is the same. In time this system will become an older model and if a reconfiguration would be needed in the future you would want to upgrade all of the equipment at the same time. Site work could be done for \$20,000 to \$50,000 and he could possibly not get a high degree of reliability or they could install the capture effect on for about \$80,000 to \$100,000. Snyder has contacted the FAA and because the Glideslope does not work it is eligible for FAA funding and AIP-13 could be amended at 15%. We are still under the existing grant amount. The used system will take until August 1 to install. Snyder stated he has contacted flight procedures to find out what the drop dead date is and he believes there is room to do this but he needs to give a notice to proceed tomorrow in order to make the deadline. Snyder stated the Capture Effect Glideslope is what is needed and if it can be done in the time allotted by the time a runway extension or any physical

HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY

JULY 17, 2008

end of runway project was done the system could be upgraded. Snyder stated this is a better long term solution and gives a higher percent of reliability. The contractor has given a 95% reliability rate on how the Capture Effect Glideslope would work. The contractor is taking risks, he will install it, tweak it and then fly it immediately. It will have to work the first or second flight check or the flight check will have to be delayed. There is not enough time in between to do our own site condition flight check. Kapostasy asked what is the age of the Glideslope equipment we are modifying? Snyder stated it was installed in 1982. It is an old piece of equipment, it is operational and feasible if it is calibrated properly. Silvey asked how old is the replacement? Snyder did not have that information. Howard asked what would the new equipment cost? Snyder stated \$135,000 to \$155,000. That amount would still be within a grant amendment amount. Snyder stated he and Dan Montgomery have discussed other options – one is to buy a new system, allow the flight check to go with a condition of a restriction on a visibility limit for distance. There is some risk but we could get the publication put online and get an LPV (localizer like approach with vertical guidance assistance except it is not as high as precision) 200 put on the runway which could serve until the equipment is installed. The Localizer did pass the flight check and can be used in addition to any LPV approach. Snyder would have to get FAA approval that they would still go forward with the publication and we would terminate the Glideslope until they gave it formal approval. Snyder stated this is a long shot, the FAA will not want to put out a publication until they are sure it is ready. Moran stated he does not believe any of the options other than an upgrade to the antenna will work. Snyder agreed. Silvey asked if we are spending \$100,000 for a used system now and it would cost \$150,000 for a new system will we have a shorter life? Snyder stated yes, you will have a shorter life dependency. There is still this type of equipment in service and they are currently manufacturing parts for this equipment. Silvey asked when we rebuild the runway or do any type of serious construction work on the runway, will we be modifying the equipment at that time or will be continuing the use of the existing equipment? Snyder stated we would continue to use the existing equipment. The Glideslope would not be affected by the reconstruction project; we would have to look at the elevations very closely. Snyder stated under the condition of an extension it would be permissible to make a federal request for upgrading of the entire system. Silvey asked if we have a commitment from the FAA for the grant amendment funding so if we give approval we have grant funding to pay for it? Snyder stated he will have to write a very good justification to qualify and he would have to send an amendment letter in right away. Silvey asked when would we know if we have the price and the grant amendment by the next meeting? Snyder stated yes. The FAA is not good at writing back on whether they accept grant amendment requests, they either pay it or they don't. He does have an Email stating this is an eligible item, the justification and amendment letter has to be submitted to the FAA as soon as possible. Snyder stated the timing is very important, if all of the bills are not submitted by October then we will have to wait until the next grant season. He will have to receive all the final invoices and the grant request by the deadline. Amendments are usually paid from discretionary

## HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY

JULY 17, 2008

money that is turned back so it could be September before we see if we receive the funding. Howard asked Dan Montgomery if there is anything else that is any more important than fixing this? Montgomery stated no. Kapostasy motioned to approve the modification of the equipment in expeditious fashion and ask Woolpert Engineering to write the grant modification request on our behalf. We would pay for this out of existing funds if necessary but we are seeking FAA funding. Kapostasy authorized the contract to purchase immediately. Moran seconded. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

### AIP-13, Parallel Taxiway Construction

All pavement markings are completed. The Division "B" Contract (Shelly & Sands) is prepared to be closed out this evening. The Division "C" Contract (Michiana) is substantially complete except for the Glideslope. Snyder requested approval of the final close-out change order for Shelly & Sands in the amount of \$2,970.16. This includes marking. Kapostasy motioned to approve. Tolson seconded. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

Snyder requested approval of Pay Request #11 for AIP-13 in the amount of \$16,469.00. Tolson motioned to approve. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

### Public Advisory Committee Meeting

Snyder distributed drawings of the three alternatives discussed at the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting. This is the information that will be presented at the July 31<sup>st</sup> Public Information Meeting. Kapostasy asked if the orientation from 725 to 523 would it allow the 4,400 eventual crosswind runway to fit between 1100 East and 1200 East without impacting those roads? Snyder stated yes you could but 523 did not meet the wind condition so 523 was excluded from consideration. That was one of the primary ones we looked at because it put more RPZ (Runway Protection Zones) between the roads but it does not pass wind conditions. Kapostasy asked if it was close so we could ask the FAA for consideration in terms of an overall solution or was it so far out that it is not a possibility? Snyder stated it was 94 and we were looking for 95. In terms of wind it is a recommended guideline. When they looked at 725, which was 96 and is preferred. This is a 2% difference in time when it would not be usable. Kapostasy stated during the PAC meeting most of the discussion focused on two items; one was how can the neighbors avoid any extension or crosswind runway? We tried to explain that was not a likely outcome and the second issue was if there was a way for this Board to communicate to the neighbors and to the stakeholders how it has tried to balance the needs throughout the process and not interfere with County Road 1100 would be preferable but the 10 or 15 things explained to the participants helped them see through this two year process we have tried to balance all of the pieces. Snyder stated they are still working on the additional 400 feet with the FAA for validation purposes. We did say it was important to go to the public to talk about the additional 400 feet to make sure we qualify the

HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
JULY 17, 2008

thoughts and what we need to be prepared for. Silvey stated Maria Muia' will prepare a letter from the Board and incorporate the information that Kapostasy presented at the PAC meeting to be distributed at the Public Information Meeting describing what we have done in trying to work with the neighbors. A cognizant effort is being made to improve communication with the attendees. Brad Beaver stated Kapostasy's dissertation calmed the attendees, was very good and timely. Snyder stated the Public Information Meeting is not a Public Hearing. Written comments will be accepted. There will be stations set up with boards describing the Master Plan process and ultimately showing the preferred alternatives of the runway configurations or extensions and ultimately what the terminal area development will look like. Representatives from Woolpert and Aerofinity will be standing at those stations to answer questions. Kapostasy stated another issue discussed was trying to reserve some area for undetermined future uses southeast of the two runways which is not permitted within the current FAA guidelines. The plan does not show anything of that nature, based on that situation and previous discussions we might be better off entertaining Option "G" for the crosswind runway as well as Option "H" which was about 1,000 feet south of that and show both of those options on the drawings but make it clear we have not done the final engineering to determine the precise best location for the crosswind runway, Kapostasy believes we would be better suited by having it be further south and reserving some additional space on the northwest side of that intersection for apron area and future terminal area development and protecting that natural extension rather than hoping that in some way we could identify areas to the northeast, southwest or southeast which would require perimeter roads additional road cuts, etc. We don't need to make a decision today but he would recommend that we keep Option "H" on the plan and be clear we have not done the final work to determine the exact north-south location and there is work to be done including looking at wetlands, looking at where the houses are and we did not do that level of detail in order to leave our options open for a while. Snyder stated he did get the wetland determination, there is a very large wetland located centrally where the runway is currently being proposed. It is something that has to be considered. Snyder recommended the Board taking time to consider the location because if you don't get it right or close to right it will be very difficult on the environment assessment. Silvey asked if Option "H" would miss the wetlands? Snyder stated they could set up "H" to miss the wetlands, even the taxiway. Beaver asked if it is possible to submit a Master Plan with alternates in it? Snyder stated yes, there will be a section on alternates. Beaver asked if there is any negative impact to having alternatives? Snyder stated no, it is highly encouraged but ultimately the Board will have to pick one plan to go on the airport layout plan. Kapostasy stated his recommendation is strictly in terms of the public meeting, we want to share what we are recommending but the only difference in the drawing is showing "G" where it is and show "H" just south of there and say that we expect the final part to be somewhere in between there but we won't know until the detail work is done and we don't have a preference. Kapostasy motion to approve these documents for public display but to modify the one that has "A", "C", and "G" on it to add alternative "H" as a crosswind

HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
JULY 17, 2008

runway to the south to indicate that is a potential crosswind runway. Tolson seconded. Moran asked how far south is "H"? Snyder stated he has not located it yet. Snyder would like to discuss it in detail with Moran. In the PAC meeting they showed a Phase 2 extension that would go for 700 feet so it would not impact County Road 200. Snyder stated currently the distance from the end of Runway 36 (7,000 foot end) to Runway 725 configuration is approximately 6,700 feet. If we moved it 700 feet it would be at 6,000 feet. Snyder stated the FAA has said we can reserve as many locations for an air traffic control tower on existing property, if they want to go off existing property it has to be in the Master Plan Alternatives Section under the discussion section. It can't go on the ALP drawing; a separate drawing can identify the location. The FAA will not reserve the air space for it. Moran stated he envisions there would be an airport traffic area which would be about five miles from the center of the airport, wherever the designated center is located. Snyder stated that will be moved down, because there is not enough room on existing airport property or under proposed property by a proposed approved airport layout plan development it will have to be shown in the Master Plan document or would be referred to as an ultimate plan drawing. Moran stated he thinks if we put another runway in the drawing it will muddy up the waters, he does not see the advantage of putting another runway depiction on there for public consumption. The only caveat would be that this runway could move 700 feet. Kapostasy stated he would agree with Moran and would be glad to withdraw his motion as long as Snyder can assure us that we can accurately communicate to the public that there is a potential for this runway to shift 700 feet south because the person who currently lives at the end of the proposed runway and if it is moved 700 feet south it is in front of their house and if it going to be a problem he would rather show both than deal with the complexity that we showed you that it is anywhere in this range, he wants to make sure that no one tells him we built a runway and we did not tell them where it was going to be. Whatever we have to do to show where it might be and if we can do it with one, he would agree with Ted. Snyder stated he was given that flexibility and he understands Moran's point of not showing two runways and people thinking we are building two runways. Silvey asked if it would be better to show the runway moved south 700 feet? Snyder stated right now, yes but it might be between 700 feet to 1,000 feet, he does not know yet. Silvey stated if we are only going to show one runway would it be more logical to show it shifted south on July 31<sup>st</sup>? Snyder stated yes. Kapostasy amended his motion to state it is to approve these drawings for the public but to move Option "G" 700 feet to the south. Tolson amended his second. Moran asked that it state "to insure the 6,000 feet". Kapostasy and Tolson agreed. Moran asked if the wetland can be mitigated? Snyder stated yes, but it is very expensive. There will still have to be cooperation of the environmental review groups but this would be a bigger battle than the Board would want to take on. Beaver asked Kapostasy if he anticipates there is a neighbor concern about the crosswind runway? Kapostasy stated there continues to be a neighbor concern about the historical issues of a misunderstanding that an extension of the runway or addition of a crosswind runway will bring in 747's to land. There continues to be a misunderstanding of the nature of these improvements being



HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
JULY 17, 2008

for safety and not for landing larger and heavier planes. Silvey stated if we make this revision we will need Maria (Muia') to send out another E-mail of the amended plate to everyone who attended the PAC meeting. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

AIP-14, Airport Master Plan

Snyder requested approval and signature on the pay request for AIP-14, Airport Master Plan in the amount of \$111,240.00. Tolson motioned to approve. Kapostasy seconded. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

Runway Crack Repair and Apron Lighting

Snyder stated he did prepare two quotation packages for the runway crack repair and apron lighting to be received September 4, 2008. Notice to proceed could be issued at the same time and it could be completed this year. Silvey asked Snyder if he has proposals for the engineering? Snyder stated he does not nor does he have the electrical package. Kapostasy asked if the electrical would be a bid package? Snyder stated no, it is a study only. Silvey asked if Snyder had a estimate on Woolpert's fees? Snyder estimated \$10,000 as a not to exceed amount. Kapostasy motioned to authorize Woolpert to prepare the engineering and bid packages for runway and taxiway crack repair and apron lighting with their fee not to exceed \$10,000 for a September bid receipt and everything would be marked pending final approval of available funds by the Board to make sure the bidders are aware these projects may not go forward this year. Tolson seconded. Motion carried unanimously (4-0). Howard stated no wage rates, no Bid Bond will be required. A Payment Certificate Bond will be required and these will be quotes. No notice will be published.

Woolpert Invoices

Snyder requested approval of payment of the final invoice of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in the amount of \$2,033.75. Total for this project is \$11,303.75. The fee was \$13,000. Tolson motioned to approve. Kapostasy seconded. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

**Legal Counsel Report**

Additional Appropriation

Mike Howard stated there is approximately \$95,000 available for appropriation from the Airport Capital Fund (#114) and recommended an Additional Appropriation be requested and appropriated into the Buildings and Grounds line item for the next County Council meeting. Kapostasy motioned to approve. Moran seconded. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

HAMILTON COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
JULY 17, 2008

Operation and Maintenance Agreement

Howard requested signature of Agreement for the Operation and Maintenance of the Indianapolis Executive Airport between Hamilton County Airport Authority and Montgomery Aviation, Inc. Kapostasy motioned to authorize the President and Secretary to sign the agreement. Tolson seconded. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

**Secretary's Report**

Kim Rauch reported the Airport Authority's 2009 Budget Hearing is scheduled for August 19, 2008 at 10:15 a.m.

Next Meeting – August 7, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.

Silvey adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

**Present**

Tom Kapostasy, Vice President  
Ted Moran, Board Member  
Don Silvey, President  
Mike Howard, Attorney  
Andrea Montgomery, Montgomery Aviation  
Dan Montgomery, Montgomery Aviation  
Carl Winkler, Montgomery Aviation  
Kim Rauch, Secretary  
Chris Snyder, Woolpert Engineering  
Warren White, Willow Marketing  
Tania Lopez, Indianapolis Star  
Evan Kellum

**APPROVED**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Don Silvey, President

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTEST**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kim Rauch, Secretary

Date: \_\_\_\_\_